

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

RICARDO MAYFIELD

Plaintiff,

v.

KAISER PICKLES, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:12-cv-229

Beckwith, J.
Bowman, M.J.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma paupris*, initiated this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq. against his former employer alleging employment discrimination based on his race and alleged disability. On August 17, 2012, Plaintiff filed a notice of dismissal with the Court, wherein Plaintiff asserts that he agrees with Defendants' attorney that dismissal is appropriate. (Doc. 17). Thereafter, on August 21, 2012, the Court set this matter for a status conference, by phone, in order to confirm that Plaintiff intended to dismiss this action. A status conference was held on September 10, 2012, wherein counsel for Defendant appeared by phone. Plaintiff did not call in to the conference or otherwise contact the Court regarding the status of this matter.

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the undersigned herein **RECOMMENDS** that this case be dismissed *without prejudice* from the active docket of this Court.

s/ Stephanie K. Bowman
Stephanie K. Bowman
United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

RICARDO MAYFIELD

Plaintiff,

v.

KAISER PICKLES, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:12-cv-229

Beckwith, J.
Bowman, M.J.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to this Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** of the filing date of this R&R. That period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion by either side for an extension of time. All objections shall specify the portion(s) of the R&R objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. A party shall respond to an opponent’s objections within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** after being served with a copy of those objections. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).